arXiv:1401.5216v1 [cs.DC] 21 Jan 2014

Multi-GPU parallel memetic algorithm for capacitated vehicle routing problem

Michał Karpiński and Maciej Pacut

Institute of Computer Science, University of Wrocław
Joliot-Curie 15, 50-383 Wrocław, Poland
karp@cs.uni.wroc.pl
pct@cs.uni.wroc.pl

Abstract. The goal of this paper is to propose and test a new memetic algorithm for the capacitated vehicle routing problem in parallel computing environment. In this paper we consider simple variation of vehicle routing problem in which the only parameter is the capacity of the vehicle and each client only needs one package. We present simple reduction to prove the existence of polynomial-time algorithm for capacity 2. We analyse the efficiency of the algorithm using hierarchical Parallel Random Access Machine (PRAM) model and run experiments with code written in CUDA (for capacities larger than 2).

1 Introduction

In Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem (CVRP) we consider following scenario: we own a delivery business that sends goods to clients via trucks. Transport begins at the base station. The time needed to travel from base station to every client (and from every client to every other client) is known. We can look at this set-up as a full weighted graph with one highlighted vertex. The goal is to deliver every package to clients in smallest time possible according to thier demands. The capacity of each truck is fixed. The truck need to go back to the base station to reload when empty. General CVRP assume that demand of every client, number of trucks and thier capacity are not bound by any assertion. The vehicle routing problems have attracted the interest of combinatorial optimization experts for over 50 years. The motivation to study this class of problems lies in its relevence to the real world as well as its difficulty. One of books that are worth mentioning is [1]. It is an overview of main VRP variations (including CVRP). Authors show exact and heuristic methods of finding the solutions. Large portion of the book covers the main variations, like: VRP with time windows, backhauls, and pickup and delivery.

In our variation of the CVRP we assume that every client demands exactly one package and we only have one delivery truck with fixed capacity. It is easy to see that with these constraints our problem transforms into a permutation problem. Furthermore, it is very similar to the classical Travelling Salesman Problem (TSP) with only diffrence being exclusion of the base station from permutation.

Therefore, only vertices that represent clients are being permutated. Next, we can evenly partition the resulting permutation into sets of size equal to the capacity of the truck. These sets represent paths the truck will make with each round of deliveries.

The similarity to the TSP doesn't end here. If we set the capacity of the truck to the number of clients, then CVRP becomes TSP. Because of that, further in the paper (in the experiments section), we test how well our algorithm performs in solving TSP problem on well known data sets taken from TSPLIB [7].

The memetic algorithm that we propose is the combination of Simple Genetic Algorithm [2] and Simulated Annealing [3]. It can be parallelized in very natural way on multiple GPUs using the Island Model [4]. Each GPU contains one population. We apply series of genetic operators to the population. In addition, after each iteration of the algorithm, the local search algorithm is run on every specimen for further solution improvement. Thanks to the parallel nature of the GPU, we can apply all these funtions to each of the specimen at the same time, which greatly accelerates the computation.

The rest off the paper is organized as follows: first we give a specification of the CVRP variation we will be solving and define other variations needed for proving the existence of polynomial-time algorithm for capacity 2. The forementioned proof is the content of the next chapter. Finally we introduce a new memetic multi-GPU algorithm and give its theoretical analysis of time complexity and cost. After that we show results of performed experiments. The main goal is to show scalability of the algorithm.

2 Capacitated vehicle routing problem

Let us consider full weighted undirected graph $G = \langle V, E, w\rangle$, where $V = \{v_1, \cdots, v_n\}$ is the set of vertices, E is the set of edges, and $w : E \to \mathbb{N}$ is the weight function. Let v_1 be the base station. In general form the VRP (Vehicle Routing Problem) problem is to find disjoint cycle cover in G (of minimal weight), in which each cycle intersects exactly at the base station v_1. We can formalize this by the following definitions:

Definition 1. *Let cycle cover of $G = \langle V, E\rangle$ be the set of cycles in G, that every vertex $u \in V$ belongs to exactly one cycle. Let $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$ be the set of cycles in G. Then:*

$$C \text{ is cycle cover of } G \overset{df}{\Leftrightarrow} \forall_{i\neq j} c_i \cap c_j = \emptyset \wedge \bigcup_l c_l = V$$

Definition 2. *Base cycle cover is the cycle cover of $G = \langle V, E\rangle$ in which each cycle share one vertex v_1. Formally, let $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$ be the set of cycles in G. Then:*

$$C \text{ is base cycle cover of } G \overset{df}{\Leftrightarrow} \forall_{i\neq j} c_i \cap c_j = \{v_1\} \wedge \bigcup_l c_l = V$$

Definition 3. *Weight w_c of cycle $\langle u_1, u_2, ..., u_k \rangle$ is the sum of each edge's weight that belongs to the cycle:*

$$w_c(\langle u_1, u_2, ..., u_k \rangle) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(u_i, u_{i+1}) + w(u_k, u_1)$$

Definition 4. *Weight w_r of cycle cover $\langle c_1, c_2, ..., c_l \rangle$ is the sum of all cycle weights:*

$$w_r(\langle c_1, c_2, ..., c_l \rangle) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} w_c(c_i) \tag{1}$$

Definition 5. *The optimizatoin problem VRP is the problem of finding base cycle cover of G with minimum weight (from equality 1).*

Definition 6. *The decision problem VRP: for given graph G and constant s, can we find base cycle cover of G with weight less than or equal to s.*

Definition 7. *The optimization problem cVRP (for $c \in \mathbb{N}$) is the problem of finding the base cycle cover of G with minimal weight (from equality 1). In addition, we want length of all the cycles to be at most c.*

Definition 8. *The decision problem cVRP (for $c \in \mathbb{N}$): for given graph G and constant s, can we find base cycle cover of G with weight less than or equal to s. In addition, we want length of all the cycles to be at most c.*

Later in this paper we present algorithm for optimazation problem, but we use decision version of given problem for the purpose of analysing the computational complexity of different VRP variations. Let us consider some more variations that we will use in the next chapter to prove existence of polynomial-time algorithm for VRP with capacity 2:

Definition 9. *cVRP$_0$ (for $c \in \mathbb{N}$) is a variation of cVRP in which all edges incident to v_1 have weight 0.*

Definition 10. *c_{eq}VRP (for $c \in \mathbb{N}$) is a variation of cVRP in which each cycle of base cycle cover has length exactly c.*

Definition 11. *c_{eq}VRP$_0$ (for $c \in \mathbb{N}$) is the intersection of cVRP$_0$ and c_{eq}VRP.*

Definition 12. *$f(n)_{eq}$VRP$_0$ (dla $c \in \mathbb{N}$) is a variation of VRP in which each cycle of base cycle cover has length $f(n)$, where n is the number of vertices in G.*

Definition 13. *Let G be the full graph. MinimumPerfectMatching is the problem of finding full matching in G of minimal weight. We consider only graphs with even number of vertices (for purpose of analysis).*

It is widely known that MinimumPerfectMatching belongs to P.

We have given very precise definitions of the VRP variations. We can formulate our variation more briefly, without using all of the auxiliary definitions and notations writen above. The problem of CVRP is to find disjoint full partitioning $X_m = \{X_1, \cdots, X_k\}$ of set $V_1 = V \setminus \{v_1\}$ and permutations σ_i for each X_i such that:

$$X_m = \operatorname*{minarg}_{X \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{|X_i|-1} w(\sigma_i(j), \sigma_i(j+1)) + w(v_1, \sigma_i(1)) + w(\sigma_i(|X_i|), v_1) \right)$$

Where $\mathcal{P}$ is set of all valid partitionings. In our variation the size of each set X_i in partitioning is constrained and it is equal to c, which is the parameter of the problem. We can interpret c as the capacity of the truck. Note that with this constraint the truck always takes exactly c packages from the base station. Also note that since the partitioning X is disjoint, the truck never visits the same client twice and is only going back to the base station after the loading is empty.

Problem formulated such way is NP-complete, which can be shown with reduction from Minimum Assignment problem [6].

3 Computational complexity

Here we prove that ${}_{2_{eq}}VRP \in P$. Later we will also prove NP-completness of ${}_{f(n)_{eq}}\mathrm{VRP}_0$ for selected $f(n)$.

In the proves below we will consider problems as formal languages. From this angle we can say that problems are sets of instances that satisfy given constraints. This allow us to prove time complexity of decision problems using well known one-to-many reductions (also known as polynomial reductions). As an example we give a classical travelling salesman problem where we are searching for the shortest hamiltonian cycle in given graph:

$$TSP = \{\langle G, s\rangle : \text{G has Hamiltionian cycle of weight} \leq s\}$$

Some instance $\langle H, s'\rangle \in TSP$ if and only if in H exists Hamiltonian cycle of weight $\leq s'$.

Now we can prove that ${}_{2_{eq}}VRP \in P$. We will do this by showing two reductions:

$${}_{2_{eq}}\mathrm{VRP} <_p {}_{2_{eq}}\mathrm{VRP}_0 <_p MinimumPerfectMatching$$

Lemma 1. *Problem ${}_{2_{eq}}VRP$ is reducible in polynomial time to ${}_{2_{eq}}VRP_0$.*

Proof. Let us consider instance of ${}_{2_{eq}}VRP$, that is: full graph $G = \langle V, E, w\rangle$ and constant s ($|V|$ is odd). We construct $H = \langle V, E, w'\rangle$ in the following way:

$$w'(u,v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = v_1 \vee v = v_1 \\ w(v_1,u) + w(u,v) + w(v,v_1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We show that this equivalence is true:

$$\langle G, s\rangle \in 2_{eq}\text{VRP} \Leftrightarrow \langle H, s\rangle \in 2_{eq}\text{VRP}_0$$

($\Rightarrow$) Assume that there exist a base cycle cover $R_G = \langle c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{\frac{|V|-1}{2}}\rangle$ of G with weight at most s. Graph H has the same set V and E as G. We construct base cycle cover $R_H = \langle d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{\frac{|V|-1}{2}}\rangle$ that has the same cycles as R_G. Consider $c_i = \langle v_1, u, v\rangle$, $d_i = \langle v_1, u, v\rangle$. Weight of c_i is $w(v_1, u) + w(u, v) + w(u, v_1)$. Weight of d_i is:

$$w_c(d_i) = w'(v_1, u)+w'(u, v)+w'(v, v_1) = 0+(w(v_1, u)+w(u, v)+w(u, v_1))+0 = w_c(c_i) \tag{2}$$

Corresponding cycles has the same weight, so cycle cover R_G i R_H has the same weight s. In H there exist a cycle of wight less then or equal s. That means: $H \in 2_{eq}\text{VRP}_0$.

($\Leftarrow$) Similar to ($\Rightarrow$). We use the same cycle cover but analyse the equation (2) in the other way.

Reduction is polynomial. Time needed to construct function w' is $O(|E|)$ which is straightforward, because each argument of w' need at most two calls to function w.

□

Lemma 2. *Problem $2_{eq}VRP_0$ reducible in polynomial time to $MinimumPerfectMatching$.*

Proof. Let us consider decision versions of this problems. Lets take instance of 2_{eq}VRP_0, that is: full weighted graph $G = \langle V, E, w\rangle$ and number s ($|V|$ is odd) and lets construct the instance of Minimum Perfect Matching $\langle H, s\rangle$. We construct H by removing v_1 from G.

We show that this equivalence is true:

$$\langle G, s\rangle \in 2_{eq}\text{VRP}_0 \Leftrightarrow \langle H, s\rangle \in \text{MinimumPerfectMatching}$$

($\Rightarrow$) Lets assume, that there exist a cycle cover $R_G = \langle c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{\frac{|V|-1}{2}}\rangle$ of G with weight $\leq s$. We give smallest matching in H by chosing from each cycle the edge not incident to v_1. Such matching has weight $\leq s$, because removed edges had weight 0.

($\Leftarrow$) In the other way we assume that there exist a matching $S = \{\langle u_1, u_2\rangle, \ldots, \langle u_{k-1}, u_k\rangle\}$ in H with weight $\leq s$. We build base cycle cover by constructing cycle c_i for all $\langle x_i, y_i\rangle$ in matching: $c_i = \langle v_1, x_i, y_i\rangle$. The new cycle cover has weight $\leq s$, because its weight equals the weight of S. Additional edges $\langle v_1, x_i\rangle$, $\langle y_i, v_1\rangle$ has weight 0.

The reduction is polynomial and its time complexity is $O(|V|)$. In order to construct graph H we remove one vertex and $|V| - 1$ edges.

□

Corollary 1 *From lemma (1) and (2) we conclude, that $2_{eq}VRP$ is in P.*

We now see that for small capacity, the VRP becomes trivial. Lets now shift our attention to VRP problems in which the capacity is related to the size of the problem. Let $G = \langle V, E, w\rangle$ be a full weighted graph, where $|V| = n$.

Lemma 3. *Problem $n_{eq}VRP$ is NP-complete.*

Proof. This is trivial. Problem $n_{eq}VRP$ is exactly the same as TSP. The salesman start at v_1 and has to visit all other verticies exactly once before returning to the base.

□

Lemma 4. *Problem $(\frac{n}{k})_{eq}VRP$ is NP-zupełny.*

Proof. We show reduction from $n_{eq}VRP$. let $\langle G, s\rangle$ be the instance of decision version of $n_{eq}VRP$. We construct H and s', so that:

$$\langle G, s\rangle \in n_{eq}VRP \iff \langle H, s'\rangle \in (\frac{n}{k})_{eq}VRP \tag{3}$$

Graph H is constructed be copied k times the graph G. We merge all base stations of the copies to one vertex and we add edges between all copies of weight eqaul infinity. Notice, that H is now a full weighted graph with number of vertecies equal $k \cdot n$. let $s' = k \cdot s$.

($\Rightarrow$) Lets assume, that there exist base cycle cover R_G consisting of one cycle that is covering all vertices of G with weight $\leq s$. Cycle cover of H (each cycle of length $(\frac{n \cdot k}{k}) = n$) will have exactly k cycles. Each cycle will visit one of the copies of graph G and it will equal to R_G. Therefore if we have k cycle covers R_G, each of weight less the or equal s, then weight of R_H is less then or equal to $k \cdot s = s'$.

($\Leftarrow$) Lets assume, that there exists a cycle cover R_H of graph H, each of length $(\frac{n \cdot k}{k}) = n$, that sums up to $\leq k \cdot s$. Notice that each cycle has to go throught exactly one copy of graph G. If not, then at least one cycle would have an edge of weight equal infinity. Therefore, if we have k cycles and each of them goes throught one copy of G, then from pigeonhole principle at least one of the cycles has to have a weight $\leq s$. We take this cycle and construct cycle cover of graph G consisting of only this cycle.

□

4 The GPU algorithm

To solve capacited vehicle routing problem we chose memetic algorithm, which is modification of genetic algorithm by addition of local search in each iteration. Used evolutionary operators are: CX, OX, PMX [5]. In figure (1.1) we present parallel version of memetic algorithm.

Algorithm 1.1. Parallel memetic algorithm schema

```
parfor(1..g) do
  population = random_population();
  while(termination_conditon()) do
    parfor(1..c) do
      calculate_fitness(population);
      mutation(population);
      crossover(population);
      local_search(population);
      selection(population);
    end
    out_migration = select_migration(population);
    broadcast(out_migration);

    in_migration = receive();

    population.append(in_migration);
    selection(population);
  end
  return best(population);
end
```

4.1 Algorithm analysis

We use hierarchical PRAM model in analysis. Hierarchy consists of CPU and its memory and multiple GPUs with their memory and cores. We assume that number of islands is equal to number of GPUs, and size of population on each isle is equal to number of cores on GPU (all GPUs are the same).
Let's assume following denotations:

- $T(g, c, n, i)$ - time of execution of algorithm on g GPUs, each with c cores on data of size n on i iterations
- $C(g, c, n, i)$ - cost of execution of algorithm with argument named above. Equation for cost is $C(g, c, n, i) = g \cdot c \cdot T(g, c, n, i)$.

Execution time is influenced by following variables:

- n - number of vertices in graph
- g - number of islands (equal to number of GPUs)
- c - size of population on each isle (equal to number of cores)
- e - number of specimen sent to other islands on every migration
- i - number of performed iterations
- f - frequency of migrations
- $cross(n)$, $mut(n)$, $eval(n)$ - time costs of single crossover, mutation and evaluation

– pr_{cross}, pr_{mut} - probability of applying crossover and mutation

Time complexity is calculated as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(g,c,n,i) &= T_{init} + i \cdot (T_{cross} + T_{mut} + T_{eval} + T_{i_sel}) + \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{f} \cdot T_{o_sel} \\
T_{init} &= O\left(\frac{c \cdot n}{c}\right) \\
T_{cross} &= O\left(\frac{pr_{cross} \cdot cross(n) \cdot \binom{c}{2}}{c}\right) \\
T_{mut} &= O\left(\frac{pr_{mut} \cdot mut(n) \cdot c}{c}\right) \\
T_{eval} &= O\left(\frac{eval(n) \cdot c}{c}\right) \\
T_{i_sel} &= O\left(\log\left(c + \binom{c}{2} \cdot pr_{cross}\right)\right) \\
T_{o_sel} &= O\left(\log(c + e \cdot (p-1))\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$T_{init}, T_{cross}, T_{mut}, T_{eval}$ are divided by c, because each GPU has c cores that can perform those operations in parallel. T_{i_sel} equals to the time of parallel sorting of population enlarged by specimen that were created during crossover. T_{o_sel} equals to the time of parallel sorting of population enlarged by specimen received from other islands. Costs of crossover, mutation and evaluation are at most linear with respect to n. From above assumptions we have:

$$T(g,c,n,i) \in O(i \cdot (n + pr_{cross} \cdot n \cdot c) + \frac{i}{f} \cdot n \cdot (\log(c + e \cdot g)))$$

Assuming that amount of exchanged specimen and probability of mutation are usually small, we can treat those values as constants, resulting with:

$$T(g,c,n,i) \in O(i \cdot n + \frac{i}{f} \cdot n \cdot \log(c+g))$$

With above simplification we can estimate cost as:

$$C(g,c,n,i) \in O(c \cdot (g \cdot i \cdot n + \frac{i}{f} \cdot g^2))$$

We choose a model of speedup where we require sequential and parallel algorithm to perform the same number of iterations. For each iteration of sequential algorithm, the parallel algorithm performs g times more iterations because it operates on g GPUs. To calculate speedup we launch sequential algorithm for $i \cdot g$ iterations and parallel algorithm for i iterations on each GPU.

$$S(g,c,n,i) = \frac{T(1,c,n,i\cdot g)}{T(g,c,n,i)} = \frac{n\cdot(g\cdot i)}{i\cdot n + \frac{i}{f}(n\cdot\log g)} = \frac{n\cdot g}{n + \frac{1}{f}(n\cdot\log g)}$$

For optaining maximal performance n must be close to number of cores, so we substitute $c = n$. Number of cores in one Tesla S2050 GPU is 448. Optimal frequency optained from our experiments equals 50. Final form of speedup is:

$$S(g,448,448,i) = \frac{448\cdot g}{448 + \frac{1}{50}(448\cdot\log g)} \tag{4}$$

5 Computational experiments

Implementation of the algorithm was written in C++ using CUDA and Open-MPI library. All the tests were performed on nVidia Tesla S2050 1U Computing System.

First batch of tests we executed on randomly generated data using one GPU. Our goal was to empirically determine the best parameters for our program. In table 1 we can see performence results of basic crossover operators: PMX, OX and CX. We messure performance in number of iterations the algorithm has to make in order to reach certain reference solution using one of the crossover operators. Total of 1000 different results were generated at this stage of experiments and the size of input data was increasingly larger. In over 99% cases the CX operator yielded best results, as it had fastest convergence rate. We selected few most interesting results.

n	OX	PMX	CX
30	19	20	**10**
51	69	56	**32**
99	354	249	**101**
300	2510	1223	**467**
501	11559	5979	**234**
999	23043	7384	**1534**

Table 1. Performance for crossover operators on single GPU (n - number of clients).

We picked the best value for probability of mutation in similar manner. This time we ploted 1000 graphs from execution of program run on randomly generated data. This time we only chose CX operator for crossover, paying attention to the previous results. We studied the plots for mutation probability values ranged from 0.01 to 1.00. High values of pr_{mut} obviously produces random results. No signs of convergence was seen. We concluded, that the best value is $pr_{mut} = 0.15$. On figure 1 we present selected plots (tests executed on very large input).



Fig. 1. Algorithm performance on single GPU with different mutation probabilities.

The data sets with known optimal results for our CVRP variation does not exist, so it is hard to test the algorithms performance. To conclude our experiments we need to reference our results with some previous results. In order to make a comparison with the results of other researchers, we fixed the capacity of the truck to the number of cities. Now we could solve instances of the travelling salesman problem, so we were able to use known data sets, which gives us at least some knowledge about performance of the algorithm. In table 2 we can see results of this set of tests. We present percentage relative deviation optimal solutions to selected problem instances taken from TSPLIB.

Finally we show how experimental speedup relates to theoretical speedup (equation 4). We messured 1000 experimental speedup and plotted its avarage on the same graph that we plotted theoretical speedup. Results are shown in figure 2.

6 Conclusions

Presented algorithm performs well on single GPU. Speedup results were satisfactory, but not ideal (very far from linear). We believe it's due to a very simple parallel model. Note that we could only test speedup for limited number of GPUs due to the fact that nVidia Tesla S2050 Computing System has only 4 GPUs. Either way on figure 2 we can see that experimental speedup corresponds with theoretical very well. On another note our memetic algorithm can be used in solving TSP as the results were not far away from optimal.

problem	*prd*	*problem*	*prd*
bayg29	0.00	bays29	0.00
brazil58	0.55	brg180	1.65
gr120	1.01	hk48	0.87
gr17	0.00	si1032	7.79
gr21	0.00	si175	1.48
gr24	0.00	si535	6.92
gr48	0.73	swiss42	0.24

Table 2. Comparison of memetic algorithm to selected TSPLIB instances.



Fig. 2. Comparison of experimental and theoretical speedup.

The vehicle routing problem and its many variations are NP-complete. It would seem that our variation might not be computionally hard, since we greatly simplified the constrains. Unfortunelly our variation is NP-complete, which we show in different paper that is not yet published. We also explore more variations of CVRP adding more constraints to the problem discussed here. It may be reassuring that if we set the capacity of the truck to 2, the problem becomes trivialy easy to compute. On the other hand, it might not even be practically usable. Either way, we believe that it is importnant to be aware of the barrier of cumputing difficulty of the problem, which is another motivation to study simplified versions of the NP-complete problems.

References

1. Toth P., Vigo D.: The Vehicle Routing Problem. Society for Industrial & Applied Mathematics (2001)
2. Vose M. D.: The simple genetic algorithm: foundations and theory. Massachusetts institute of technology (1999)
3. Gelatt C. D., Kirkpatrick S., Vecchi M. P.: Optimization by Simulated Annealing. Science, New Series, Vol. 220, No. 4598. (May 13, 1983), pp. 671–680.
4. Whitley D.: A genetic algorithm tutorial. Statistics and Computing, June 1994, Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 65–85
5. Deepa S. N., Sivanandam S. N.: Introduction to Genetic Algorithms. Springer (2008)
6. Bandelt H., Crama Y., Spieksma F.: Approximation algorithms for multi-dimensional assignment problems with decomposable costs. Discrete Applied Mathematics 49 (1994), p. 25–40
7. TSPLIB data sets, `http://comopt.ifi.uni-heidelberg.de/software/TSPLIB95/`